

Hon. Mr. BUREAU: That is a bad name.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: Its first duty was to itself, and if perchance it could, besides serving its political fortunes, do something for the country, it would. That is true, and cannot be denied. Otherwise it is impossible to explain why intelligent men, men of talent, men of vast experience, would allow the country to go through so many hardships during the last nine years without adopting measures so glaringly, so urgently required for its welfare. Taking the record of the Liberal party in the last nine years, you cannot explain it except by the fact that they considered it was first bound by its paramount duty to itself. First, it had to stay in office. It had utterly forgotten the inspiring lesson which the Conservative party gave it in the olden days. In 1896 the Conservative party, under the leadership of Sir Charles Tupper, went to certain defeat—why? Because it had a duty to perform, and it did it. The Liberal party stayed in power for nine years, and all that time it knew that many industries of this country were suffering.

Hon. Mr. RANKIN: They were prospering.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: No, they were dying.

Hon. Mr. LACASSE: Which were dying?

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: The cotton industry was suffering badly, and the woollens were dying.

Hon. Mr. LACASSE: With reference to wool and cotton dyeing, this House is fully aware of the colour my honourable friend prefers.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU: Cottons began to suffer when you came back to power.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: During these nine years the Liberal party did nothing—it dared not do anything—to save or help these industries. But it remained in power. It did so through political expediency, and now it is actuated by political expediency again. It lost the West, and now it wants to get back its Western clientèle; it is pleading for its Western clientèle. But, notwithstanding its appeal to sectionalism, the fiscal unity of this country will be accomplished. In ten years from now, if conditions such as we can foresee should prevail, our exporters of wheat from the West will have formidable rivals. The farmers will have to turn to general farming and therefore to their home market. They will require manufactures and large centres of population.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN.

When that comes to pass, everyone in this country will require and desire, and will obtain without trouble, a reasonable amount of protection. The time will have passed when a small section of the country could exact free trade against the vital interests of the whole. The Liberals should foresee this inevitable change and act accordingly. But they can only think of the immediate advantage of getting back their Western clientèle, and so they point an accusing finger at us and say, "The cost of living will go up; the people will be exploited for the benefit of the manufacturers; the consumer will be sacrificed to the producer"—as if we were not all producers as well as consumers.

The lesson of the last election should be better understood. In time it does not pay to pit the sentiment of one locality against the sentiment of another, and particularly against that of the entire country. The Liberals should know that. They have catered exclusively to the West, and with what result? Have we not a clear mandate from the West, as well as from the East, for protection? Why should the Liberal party adopt again a policy aiming to create a cleavage between the East and the West? Is it not hard enough to administer the affairs of this country? Has it not difficulties great and numerous enough to solve? Surely now is the time for the Liberal party to cast aside its old policy, which was all for the West, because the West was its master. It is free now, and it has everything to gain by remaining so. At all events, it should now give the Government, freshly elected, some reasonable measure of time and liberty to carry out the program that it has preached from East to West and is now endeavouring conscientiously to convert into proper legislation.

Hon. N. A. BELCOURT: Honourable members, I have no intention of discussing this Bill—or, for that matter, any other Bill that may be submitted to us—on the ground that has been taken by my honourable friend. I rise rather to ask him whether, in all conscience, he does not think it a very serious mistake to introduce into this House discussions on purely party matters. My honourable friend has spent the whole of his time, from the moment he rose until the moment he sat down, in rehashing all the political issues of the last campaign. Now, I have had occasion more than once to protest against party discussions in the Senate of Canada.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT: I think I have a perfect right to claim that at no time have I myself, even to the slightest degree, indulged